

1 OFFICE OF CONSERVATION

2 STATE OF LOUISIANA

3 -----

4 IN RE: GROUND WATER

5 RESOURCES COMMISSION MEETING

6 -----

7  
8  
9  
10  
11 REPORT OF MEETING

12 HELD AT

13 BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

14 JUNE 27, 2005  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## OFFICE OF CONSERVATION

## STATE OF LOUISIANA

-----

IN RE: GROUND WATER

RESOURCES COMMISSION MEETING

-----

Report of the public meeting held by the Ground  
Water Resources Commission, State of Louisiana, on June  
27, 2005, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

## COMMISSION MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Scott Kirkpatrick, Chairman

James H. Welsh, Commissioner of Conservation

Karen Gautreaux, Department of Environmental Quality

Zahir "Bo" Bolourchi, DOTD - Water Resources

Darwin Knochenmus, Capital Area Groundwater Commission

Richard Durrett, Sparta Aquifer Commission

John Roussel, Assistant Secretary Wildlife &amp; Fisheries

Linda Walker, League of Women Voters

Karen Irion, Department of Health and Hospitals

Bill Cefalu, Police Jury Association

Jackie Loewer, Chicot Aquifer

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## AGENDA

I. Call to Order - Governor's Office

II. Ground Water Resources Division Activities

III. Old Business

A. Update on the Sparta Area Designation

IV. New Business:

A. Legislative Update (Representative Jim Fannin  
from Jonesboro has been invited to speak)

V. Commission Comments

VI. Task Force Comments

VII. Public Comments

VIII. Schedule for Next Meeting

IX. Adjourn

## LOUISIANA GROUND WATER RESOURCES

## COMMISSION MEETING

JUNE 27, 2005

\* \* \* \* \*

MR. KIRKPATRICK:

Welcome to the meeting of the Louisiana Ground Water Resources Commission. If we could start on my right and go ahead and just introduce yourself and the group that you're representing.

MS. WALKER:

Linda Walker, and I'm representing the League of Women Voters of Louisiana.

MR. KNOCHENMUS:

Darwin Knochenmus, I represent Capital Area Groundwater Conservation Commission.

MR. BOLOURCHI:

Bo Bolourchi, Department of Transportation and Development.

MR. KIRKPATRICK:

Scott Kirkpatrick representing the Governor's Office.

MR. WELSH:

I'm Jim Welsh, Commissioner of Conservation, Department of Natural Resources.

MS. GAUTREAUX:

Karen Gautreaux, Deputy Secretary, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality.

MR. LOEWER:

Jackie Loewer representing the Chicot Aquifer.

MS. IRION:

1           Karen Irion, Deputy Chief Engineer for the Louisiana  
2 Department of Health and Hospitals.

3 MR. ROUSSEL:

4           John Roussel, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and  
5 Fisheries.

6 MR. CEFALU:

7           Bill Cefalu representing the Police Jury  
8 Association.

9 MR. DURRETT:

10          Richard Durrett representing the Sparta Aquifer  
11 Commission.

12 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

13          Thank you. At this time we will ask Mr. Tony  
14 Duplechin to go ahead and give us an update of the Ground  
15 Water Resources Division activities.

16 MR. DUPLACHIN:

17          Thank you, Scott. Instead of going over a long  
18 litany of things that the staff has done, like I have in  
19 the past, I'm just going to mention a few things and then  
20 highlight a couple of activities that we were involved  
21 in. Different meetings that we went to that concern  
22 ground water included meetings for construction of I-69  
23 through northwest Louisiana; went to a National Ground  
24 Water Association Summit in San Antonio; had several  
25 meetings with DEQ; meetings with Sabine River Compact;  
26 dealt with the City of Shreveport's Office of Operational  
27 Studies; and went to the Office of Conservation district  
28 offices in Monroe and Shreveport to bring them up to date  
29 on activities that the Ground Water Division is doing  
30 here in Baton Rouge and up in the northern part of the

1 state.

2 Two things that I'd like to highlight, though: we  
3 went to a field demonstration in West Monroe of the  
4 Wastewater Reuse Project. I think I had mentioned this  
5 before; the City of West Monroe is looking at providing  
6 six to 10 million gallons a day of wastewater that has  
7 been treated to potable standards to Graphics Packaging  
8 to get them off of the Sparta. And they've got a pilot  
9 project in the works right now, and saw in the Sunday  
10 paper up in Monroe that the Legislature did indeed  
11 provide funding for that pilot project. So I'm real  
12 anxious to see that get going and hope it works out to  
13 where they can get funding for the full project down the  
14 road.

15 Also saw in the paper where Senator Vitter had come  
16 up with some money for -- bear with me -- funding a study  
17 to see if it was feasible to use Lake D'Arbonne as a  
18 water supply for both Farmerville and Ruston. So we're  
19 anxious to -- happy that that got funded and hope that it  
20 all works out.

21 The other thing I'd like to talk about is, Friday  
22 before last I had the opportunity to participate in the  
23 Trail Blazer Resource Conservation District's Sparta  
24 Awareness Day that they put on in Jonesboro. The weather  
25 wasn't exactly the best, thunderstorms, lightning, we  
26 were afraid of tornadoes that day, so the turnout wasn't  
27 that great, but they did have about a hundred people show  
28 up at the Courthouse there in Jonesboro. A number of  
29 people got up and talked about water conservation and the  
30 Sparta, myself included, and they passed out these "Save

1 Our Sparta" kits, which was very impressive. They have a  
2 number of different things that people can use around the  
3 home to help save on the amount of water that they're  
4 using. Like this bladder that you fill up, I think it  
5 holds a half a gallon of water, and you hang it inside  
6 the tank of your commode, so every time you flush the  
7 commode that's that much less water that you use.

8 To go along with that they had a replacement flapper  
9 valve. That's something everybody anywhere, you hear  
10 your toilet making noise, then you should go check and  
11 see if your flapper valve needs to be replaced. Each kit  
12 contained a restrictive flow showerhead; cuts back on the  
13 amount of water coming out but doesn't cut back on the  
14 water pressure of the stream that comes out of the  
15 nozzle. And to go along with it there was a timer, a  
16 little hourglass timer, five minutes, put in your shower,  
17 start your shower, let it run five minutes, you should be  
18 finished. I think talking with people that were in the  
19 Navy they know that you can get real clean taking short  
20 showers.

21 Other things included an aerator to put on your  
22 kitchen sink, which, there again, cuts back on the amount  
23 of water coming out but doesn't cut back on the pressure  
24 of the water coming out of the faucet; mouse pad with  
25 different little stuff, hints, different ways to save  
26 water; Teflon tape for putting the different implements  
27 on your faucets and showerheads; magnets with "Save Our  
28 Sparta" to keep people reminded of it, and other various  
29 little things to keep in and around the kitchen and  
30 bathroom. In all I think it was 25 or \$30 worth of stuff

1 that they put in these bags and passed out. Like I said,  
2 there were a hundred people there, they had made up 400  
3 of these kits, and they're very anxious to get into the  
4 other parishes in North Louisiana. I know that there was  
5 a representative from the Sparta Commission up in Union  
6 Parish and she was anxious for them to come up to  
7 Farmerville and put on the same program. So this is one  
8 of the things that we're excited about that -- public  
9 education, people are getting involved in it already.

10 Any questions?

11 MS. GAUTREAUX:

12 That's pretty impressive and I think exciting, too,  
13 because that's where some real differences can be made,  
14 education over the long term. And I was wondering, do we  
15 have a mechanism or should we pass a motion to commend  
16 groups like this, maybe in a letter on behalf of the  
17 Commission thanking them for their efforts? Maybe do  
18 that as things like this come to our attention.

19 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

20 I don't know if we have a mechanism, but I certainly  
21 think we can do it. So I'll accept that motion. Is  
22 there a second to that motion?

23 MR. WELSH:

24 Second.

25 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

26 Commissioner Welsh second. Do we want to have the  
27 Ground Water Division draft it up?

28 MS. GAUTREAUX:

29 Absolutely.

30 MR. KIRKPATRICK:



1           That would be the motion, that the Ground Water  
2 Division draft up a letter of commendation for our  
3 approval. Should we make it upon the Commissioner's  
4 approval?

5 MS. GAUTREAUX:

6           I think we could make it upon the Commissioner's  
7 approval. We'll trust him.

8 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

9           A motion and a second. Is there --

10 MR. DURRETT:

11           Scott, can I make a comment?

12 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

13           Sure.

14 MR. DURRETT:

15           I think there are some other areas that have done it  
16 also, so if you're going to do that, I think Claiborne  
17 Parish, we've got some representatives here from  
18 Claiborne Parish that have done the same thing. So  
19 there's some others that need to be commended also.

20 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

21           Okay. This motion would be that Ground Water  
22 Division maybe investigate those areas that have held  
23 similar hearings and education days and send out a letter  
24 of commendation under the Commissioner's signature. Any  
25 other discussion on that? (No response.) Any objection?  
26 (No response.) That motion passes. Good idea.

27           Any other questions for Mr. Duplechin? (No  
28 response.)

29           Tony, I'll just ask, did they indicate how long the  
30 pilot project up in West Monroe would take?

1 MR. DUPLECHIN:

2 I think they were saying they were hoping to get  
3 started in September to November of this year to start  
4 the pilot project, but I'm not sure how long it was going  
5 to take. I would have to look that up.

6 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

7 That's fine, I was just curious. If there are no  
8 other questions we will move to the next bullet on our  
9 agenda, old business, an update on the Sparta area  
10 designation.

11 MR. DUPLECHIN:

12 Commissioner issued the Final Order Critical Ground  
13 Water Area 1-05 end of April with an effective date of  
14 August 16th. I think everyone has already read what was  
15 in the Order and what is required in the Order. The  
16 staff is currently in the process of identifying well  
17 owners that are affected by the Order, and we are  
18 proceeding from there.

19 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

20 Those would be well owners who would need to be  
21 reporting?

22 MR. DUPLECHIN:

23 Reporting on a monthly basis. There is a form in  
24 your packet, and we are still refining that form  
25 somewhat. We realize that we did not put a space on the  
26 form for a signature verifying authenticity of the  
27 information that was turned in, so we are trying to get  
28 all of that on one form without having to make it a legal  
29 size form.

30 MS. WALKER:

1 I don't know if Tony can answer this or the  
2 representatives from the Sparta can answer this, but I  
3 know when the application was submitted the USGS data  
4 showed that the 70 mgd was the current usage and that  
5 wasn't going to hold sustainability at all and the goal  
6 was to get to 52 mgd daily, you know; and since it has  
7 been, what, three years since that data was collected I  
8 would really like to know where that stands today, since  
9 it's been so long since the start of this. Is there --  
10 do we have that figure? Do we know what the usage is  
11 right now, what the drawdown is?

12 MR. DUPLECHIN:

13 If I could ask Ben McGee from USGS in Ruston, he  
14 might be able to address that.

15 MS. WALKER:

16 Do we have some 2004 or something of that nature?

17 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

18 Do you want to come up? If you'd come up, just hop  
19 on a mike, just identify yourself for the record.

20 MR. MCGEE:

21 My name is Ben McGee and I work for the US  
22 Geological Survey in Louisiana. We are in the process of  
23 compiling the 2005 water use figures right now, so that  
24 report should be published shortly, but -- in lack of  
25 that we don't have any more updated information that I  
26 can supply today.

27 MS. WALKER:

28 You don't have 2004?

29 MR. MCGEE:

30 No, ma'am. It's compiled every five years.

1 MR. DURRETT:

2 Can I ask a question while he's up here? The  
3 information that you gather, is it -- how did you  
4 determine the pumpage? Is it done by voluntary reporting  
5 or is it done by metered wells, or is it done -- how is  
6 it --

7 MR. MCGEE:

8 It's actually a variety. Depending on the water  
9 user, some water users have meters on their wells, but  
10 that report is from the water users themselves. Others  
11 have to calculate it from billing records, things of that  
12 nature, so there's a variety of sources that that water  
13 use comes from, but they are required to report as  
14 accurately as they can their water use to the state and  
15 then we in turn compile that information.

16 MR. DURRETT:

17 Take, for instance, a rural water district that  
18 doesn't have a meter on their well, do they report what's  
19 sold or -- because there's some question about how much  
20 loss you have from wellhead to the customer?

21 MR. MCGEE:

22 That's right, that is one way to do that is to go  
23 from billing records, what's sold, and then try to  
24 estimate maybe their loss on the line and estimate their  
25 usage that way.

26 MR. DURRETT:

27 What percentage of the people you think have meters  
28 on their wells, would you say?

29 MR. MCGEE:

30 In my experience probably less than 10 percent.

1 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

2 Thank you. Any other questions?

3 MR. DURRETT:

4 I have another question regarding the form to the  
5 Commissioner. Does the Commissioner have the authority  
6 to require more accurate usage data than we're getting  
7 now, or do we intend to try to get better data than just  
8 reporting it?

9 MR. WELSH:

10 I don't think the law is specific in stating that  
11 authority, but like Mr. McGee said, we want the most  
12 accurate report we can get and we'll do our best to get  
13 that. But I don't think I specifically have that  
14 authority, no.

15 MR. DURRETT:

16 I think we all want the most accurate data we can  
17 get, especially if we're going to start at a point and  
18 try to reduce it and see how conservation and education  
19 is working.

20 MR. WELSH:

21 Right.

22 MR. DURRETT:

23 But you don't have the authority to require  
24 metering, though; is that what you're saying?

25 MR. WELSH:

26 Steve? This is Stephen Walker, our Conservation  
27 attorney.

28 MR. WALKER:

29 We'll have to take a look at that as we get further  
30 into the reporting process and Order, after it becomes

1 effective, and just see what kind of data we're getting  
2 and then see where we need to take it from there. But I  
3 think we can get, with the current statute, the  
4 information we need.

5 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

6 Any other questions on old business dealing with the  
7 designation? (No response.)

8 We'll move on to new business. Tony, are you going  
9 to go ahead and do a legislative update?

10 MR. DUPLECHIN:

11 I'm going to give a brief summary of the different  
12 bills that we've been looking at, and then Representative  
13 Fannin is going to come up and talk about a couple.

14 There were some 16 different pieces of legislation  
15 that we followed this past session that either dealt  
16 directly with ground water or were related to ground  
17 water, most surface water reservoirs and the authority of  
18 the Sabine River Authority. I'll just run down them real  
19 quickly.

20 House Bill 23 by Representative Beard concerned use  
21 of reclaimed water. It was withdrawn.

22 House 123 by Representative Downs created Lincoln  
23 Parish Reservoir Authority. It was signed and is now Act  
24 40.

25 House Bill 131 by Representative Hammit concerned  
26 construction tax exemption on the Toledo Bend Dam. It's  
27 been sent to Governor Blanco.

28 House Bill 280 by Representative Gallot either  
29 created or further defined the Claiborne Parish Watershed  
30 District. It was signed and is now Act 81.

1 House Bill 357 by Representative Montgomery  
2 concerned the Lake Bistineau Conservation District and it  
3 didn't make it out of committee.

4 House Bill 387 authorized law enforcement for the  
5 Sabine River Authority. It has been sent to the  
6 Governor.

7 House Bill 388 by Representative Fannin created  
8 areas of groundwater concern; it's at Governor Blanco's  
9 office.

10 House Bill 518 by Representative Ritchie concerned  
11 Washington Parish Reservoir District. It did not make it  
12 out of committee.

13 House Bill 595 by Representative Salter concerned  
14 the power of Sabine River Authority to enter into  
15 agreements, and it has been sent to the Governor for her  
16 signature.

17 House Bill 596 by Representative Fannin created the  
18 Jackson Parish Dugdemona Watershed Authority. It was  
19 signed and is now Act 93.

20 House Bill 626 by Representative Walsworth created  
21 tax exemption for certain conservation equipment in the  
22 Sparta Groundwater Conservation District area. It did  
23 not make it out of committee.

24 Senate Bill 47 by Senator Barham created Morehouse  
25 Parish Lake Commission. It has been sent to the Governor  
26 for signature.

27 Senate Bill 76 by Senator Adley created Lake  
28 Bistineau Watershed District, it did not make it out of  
29 committee; neither did Senate Bill 111 by Senator Smith,  
30 which put limits for liability on a Toledo Bend Dam

1 failure.

2 Senate Bill 174 by Senator Nevers concerning the  
3 Washington Parish Reservoir District was withdrawn.

4 And Senate Bill 276 by Senator Gautreaux providing  
5 relative to coastal wetland areas and remediation did not  
6 make it out of committee.

7 There is one piece of federal legislation that the  
8 Department is tracking, and that's House Resolution 1386  
9 which establishes a National Drought Council within the  
10 Department of Agriculture to improve national drought  
11 preparedness, mitigation and response efforts and for  
12 other purposes, and it is currently bogged down up on the  
13 Hill, so we will keep the Commission updated on where  
14 that goes. One thing we are hoping to -- following that  
15 is hoping that there might be some kind of provision for  
16 funding for this program out of that. And at this time I  
17 would ask Representative Fannin to come up and give a  
18 review of the two pieces of legislation that he  
19 introduced.

20 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Commissioner, members.  
22 It's good to be here today. I thought I left last  
23 Thursday, but it was a short vacation, so you know how it  
24 is in this business. It's good to be here with you  
25 today. Karen, it's more enjoyable today than it was some  
26 days last week, wasn't it?

27 Members, I certainly thank you for the opportunity  
28 to come and address you today as a Ground Water  
29 Commission and, Mr. Commissioner, I thank you for the  
30 opportunity to work with you and your staff this session.



1       What we have, I represent House District 13, which is the  
2       heart of the Sparta; Jackson, Bienville, part of the west  
3       part of Ouachita Parish and the north half of Winn  
4       Parish. So my district is the heart of the Sparta. And  
5       certainly you have dealt with, and I know Karen and I go  
6       way back to 2001 to meetings with the Sparta and there  
7       are those even here in this room and many in north  
8       Louisiana that have spent a lot of years dealing with the  
9       Sparta and the concerns there.

10       My concern, shared along with my colleagues in North  
11       Louisiana, all of northeast Louisiana, north-central  
12       Louisiana, was that, you know, we have a couple of things  
13       here that we must be concerned about, first and foremost  
14       is drinking water. We know that we have a good source of  
15       drinking water now and we certainly all want to protect  
16       that, and at the same time we understand that our jobs in  
17       our rural areas are difficult to keep and also more  
18       difficult to find with the situation that we have now.  
19       So we know that it's delicate in maintaining a balance  
20       between our jobs and our drinking water and certainly we  
21       know those priorities.

22       But the reason that I filed House Bill 388 was that  
23       I came to the Legislature in 2003 and was the year that  
24       Act 49 became an instrument that we operate under today,  
25       and if you're familiar with that instrument you  
26       understand that we only had two parts to that instrument;  
27       we said in Act 49 that there was nothing wrong with our  
28       ground water or either it was critical. Now, I hope you  
29       can follow with me to understand that 'critical,' I  
30       guess, can be understood in several different ways. I

1 know that to the north of us in our sister state they use  
2 it in one way that has certainly been helpful to them,  
3 but was not used in a way whereby it carried restrictions  
4 and regulations to the degree that we have. So I guess  
5 what I'm saying to you today, Commissioners, is we have a  
6 stronger groundwater enforcement policy in place in this  
7 state than do our northern neighbors have; it does carry  
8 restrictions. So when we have restrictions, you know,  
9 water is a very sensitive issue anywhere you go. And I  
10 think we have to be mindful that it's a sensitive issue,  
11 whether it be in the wetlands or whether it be ground  
12 water, we have to be sensitive to that issue.

13 388, what I felt and I talked to the Commissioner in  
14 dealing with this trying to -- trying to make Act 49 a  
15 better instrument that we could correctly identify and  
16 label our ground water in this state, not only in the  
17 Sparta, but we have many aquifers here that we deal with  
18 and will be confronted with, and you are well aware of  
19 what happens out west and all the water fights that we  
20 have there -- or has occurred there and continues to  
21 occur over water.

22 So what I felt like, not only for the Sparta but for  
23 this state as a whole, was that we find some way to label  
24 our aquifers' conditions whereby we would not have to  
25 wait until they got critical before we could ask for some  
26 kind of help, whether it be -- and if you look at 388,  
27 part of that was through education, and I commend the  
28 Trail Blazers up in North Louisiana for what they've done  
29 working with the Police Jury. I know the Jackson Police  
30 Jury and probably the Claiborne, and certainly Smurfit-

1 Stone, one of our industries that's affected, has been a  
2 major player in trying to conserve and identify, educate  
3 the public about water, because it's their interest as  
4 well as all of us' interest that we conserve it.

5 But what 388 did, our staff, working with the  
6 Commissioner, came up with an area of groundwater concern  
7 as a middle designee. Now, if the Governor signs this  
8 bill you would have no problem with water; you would have  
9 an area of groundwater concern, which would let education  
10 and incentives be used to address that; and then you  
11 would have a critical area of groundwater concern. Now,  
12 if you listen and believe all the editorials and the  
13 publishers up in our area you would have to be concerned  
14 that 'critical' is out of the Bill. You know, critical  
15 is not out of the Bill, it's still there and it's up to  
16 the Commissioner to make that designation. We never  
17 changed anything. This House Bill 388 never changed the  
18 Commissioner's authority at all. If he sees that it's  
19 necessary to be critical, then he has that at his  
20 disposal to use that.

21 Now, let me also say this to you, Commissioners, you  
22 know, we've come a long way in medicine because of  
23 science the last 10 or 15 years. We have sent a man to  
24 the moon and certainly gone far beyond that because of  
25 science. In agriculture that I'm close to, when I was in  
26 high school, you know, one farmer fed himself and five  
27 other people. Today one farmer feeds himself and 128  
28 other people and he does that because of science, and  
29 science -- all across our sector we use science to  
30 determine and correctly determine where we are at. And I

1 hope that as we move through this process that this House  
2 Bill 388 allows science to determine exactly the  
3 condition of the Sparta Aquifer. And when we do that,  
4 then I think it will be correctly labeled. We can use  
5 education. We can use incentives. I was disappointed a  
6 little bit, you heard Senator Walsworth had a bill this  
7 year that would've given some incentives to business and  
8 industry if they chose to purchase new equipment that  
9 would actually conserve water, in short is what it did.  
10 I'm disappointed that we were not able, but I think that  
11 is the type incentives that I'm talking about here. We  
12 will continue -- I will, along with my colleagues --  
13 continue to try to get those incentives built in in  
14 legislation whereby they will be available for business  
15 and industry.

16 Following that, you know, if we're going to have  
17 education, then I filed an HCR, which is HCR 132, which  
18 is asking Department of Natural Resources to develop a  
19 water conservation model statewide. Certainly we hear  
20 the Sparta, but there again, I want to say that this is a  
21 statewide effort. What we don't have at this time is a  
22 funding source for it. I'm committed, and I hope you as  
23 a Commission and I hope the Commissioner will put into  
24 their request next year in the budget some funds to  
25 develop that model.

26 And let me just share why it's important that we  
27 have a statewide model. I go to a lot of meetings, and I  
28 know that you probably been to meetings, and they say,  
29 what are we doing education-wise? Where is our plan?  
30 Where is our education plan? Truthfully, even though I

1 must commend the Trail Blazers and I must commend the Ag  
2 Center for a tremendous job up to this point, I think  
3 there are a lot of more efforts than we need to work on  
4 to educate the public; because it may be in the Sparta  
5 now, but it will be in the Chicot next, folks, and it  
6 will be in the other aquifers.

7 So my position today is, why do we want to wait  
8 until it gets critical to start trying to educate and  
9 incentivize our businesses and our industries to conserve  
10 that water. Now, and I think it's an important point I  
11 must make, you know, we have said business and industry  
12 and I'm guilty of it, you just heard me, but, folks, it's  
13 going to be individuals, too. It can't be -- and that's  
14 what the Trail Blazers does with this little package.  
15 And I think they're committed maybe to go in the fifth  
16 grade into a lot of our schools and try to teach our  
17 youth, and I must say that that's probably, you know, old  
18 folks are hard to change sometimes, but youth are always  
19 willing to look. And I hope through this education  
20 model, and I said it in committee, what has Smokey Bear  
21 done for forest fires in America? If we could come up  
22 with something, and it may be something in some other  
23 state, but we need a symbol for water conservation. We  
24 need some type of little guy, I don't know what it would  
25 be, that we could carry into our schools that they are  
26 really going to pay attention when we go in there.

27 So that's why I filed this HCR so that we can all  
28 brainstorm in how we can come up with a water  
29 conservation model for the state as a whole. Certainly  
30 we can use it in the Sparta, but it can be used statewide

1 and it will start -- if we can have that Smokey Bear, so  
2 to speak, at all of our festivals and our carnivals and  
3 into our schools and, you know, places like that, then we  
4 will start drawing attention to the area of water  
5 conservation. And I think we must to keep us out of the  
6 situations that we see out west.

7 So I guess at this point I'd be happy to answer any  
8 questions that you might have concerning either pieces of  
9 legislation.

10 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

11 Representative Fannin, I've been concerned or I've  
12 been associated with water use over my whole career and  
13 so I think some of the points that were brought up, some  
14 of the comments earlier about what water use was, but  
15 what I'd really like to ask you is, and I haven't read  
16 Bill 388, but you -- do I understand you correctly that  
17 you would like to designate different areas depending on  
18 areas of concern, critical areas, and areas of no problem  
19 of an aquifer; am I correct in understanding you in  
20 saying that?

21 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

22 Well, let me say somewhat, but not totally. It's  
23 not how I would want to label it. It's how the  
24 Commissioner would take the information and the  
25 scientific facts available to him and he would make that  
26 designation.

27 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

28 Let me answer that then. As a groundwater  
29 hydrologist, when you look at an aquifer and try to  
30 analyze and find solutions for an aquifer, you have to

1 look at the whole aquifer. You can't partition it  
2 because it is a system. What comes from the recharge  
3 area to the discharge area is one system and you can't  
4 really partition it off and say, well, this is critical  
5 and this isn't. You can do that in terms of designating  
6 it, but scientifically that is not the way to analyze an  
7 aquifer. So if you've got parts of your aquifer that you  
8 consider to be critical, then you have to look at the  
9 whole aquifer in finding your solution. And so I would  
10 not agree, I guess, or at least not support, a system  
11 that would not look and analyze the whole aquifer as a  
12 system.

13 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

14 Well, may I respond to that? This allows that to  
15 happen. This does not piecemeal an aquifer. It allows  
16 the Commissioner as a whole to designate as he sees fit.

17 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

18 Mr. Knochenmus, I'll mention to you, House Bill 388  
19 is in your packet right there.

20 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

21 Yes, I see it, but I have not read it.

22 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

23 Karen, did you have --

24 MS. GAUTREAUX:

25 I just wanted to mention, you know, I followed it  
26 through the process from the directing, actually, and  
27 it's my understanding all it does, it doesn't change  
28 anything about our Ground Water Management Act except a  
29 label. If the Commissioner, going through the same  
30 process, for example, in this Order, finds that he's not

1 ready to require, by the same delineation process that we  
2 talked about, anything beyond conservation and education  
3 in his order, it just gives it a different designation  
4 that implies that he's not actually regulating spacing or  
5 withdrawal. It doesn't change anything else about the  
6 Act. It works in the same way it's working now; it's  
7 just that that type of activity is labeled concern. He  
8 still has the ability to put it to critical if spacing  
9 and withdrawal limitations are necessary, and then the  
10 designation. It's just really an extra designation that  
11 tells you whether or not you've gone further than  
12 conservation and education. There's nothing else  
13 actually in the Act that's changed, as far as I read it.  
14 So I was okay with that. It's actually an extra category  
15 as opposed to taking away any authority, if I understand  
16 it correctly.

17 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

18 Then for explanation, then an area would have to be  
19 already considered an area of groundwater concern before  
20 it could be designated critical?

21 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

22 No, sir; no, sir, that's strictly up to the  
23 Commissioner. Now, I would hope that in our aquifers  
24 that we pay attention enough closely to them that we  
25 could designate it an area of groundwater concern before  
26 critical. That's the purpose of it, so that it will work  
27 as an area to teach folks to conserve water prior to it  
28 getting critical. Because, I mean, according to the law  
29 when you label it as critical, even though the  
30 Commissioner has the authority not to put restrictions on



1       it, restrictions do follow with critical, and that's  
2       where the restrictions are he's able to put on any well  
3       when it's in the critical category.

4       MS. WALKER:

5             I don't have -- I mean, I've gotten it clear in my  
6       head about this labeling, but in Section 2 on  
7       legislation?

8       REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

9             Yes, ma'am. I don't have it, but go ahead, I'm  
10      familiar with it.

11      MS. WALKER:

12            It seems to contradict what you just said, but it  
13      does have a time restriction in here. It says, "Any  
14      application for designation of a critical ground water  
15      area under consideration pursuant to Act No. 49 of the  
16      2003 Regular Session of the Legislature," of course, that  
17      puts it under the 2003 legislation, "shall be considered  
18      an application for declaring an area of ground water  
19      concern." So that means that applications that were  
20      turned in asking for a critical groundwater designation  
21      automatically get bumped down to an area of concern. So  
22      I do not --

23      REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

24            Well, let me address that. You are somewhat right  
25      in that if the Governor signs this piece of legislation  
26      the Commissioner will have the option at his disposal to  
27      correctly label it. Now, I mean, when the request was  
28      turned in for critical, there was no other request to be  
29      asked for because, I mean, you had two, either it was  
30      nothing wrong or it was critical. So there was nothing

1 less than critical to be asked for. But this allows the  
2 Commissioner to use the scientific data that they have  
3 whereby to label it correctly.

4 Let me just share that. We benefit in this state in  
5 no way to incorrectly label aquifers. Now, it's been  
6 said that we can go to the Feds and we can get more money  
7 because -- if we label it critical. Let me share with  
8 you, the best way in this state to get money for any  
9 aquifer is for the local politicians, the state  
10 delegation to work together in order to ask our US  
11 Congressmen and Senators for that federal aid. Now, when  
12 there's a short in that circuit it doesn't benefit  
13 anyone. So what this allows everyone to work together  
14 whereby that we can correctly -- because it does not  
15 benefit any of us to say that it's something that it may  
16 not be, and we have to let science, through the  
17 Commissioner, decide that. We cannot let journalists and  
18 people with opinions that like to write in newspapers  
19 determine the condition of an aquifer in this state.

20 MS. WALKER:

21 Representative Fannin, I just can't imagine that  
22 folks that ask for a critical groundwater area  
23 designation and have gone through the trouble of having  
24 hydrologists study it, et cetera, would turn in a  
25 frivolous request.

26 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

27 Well, either they had -- certainly they've turned it  
28 in because they couldn't say there wasn't anything wrong,  
29 and that was the only option. Maybe if they had another  
30 option they would have asked for another request.

1 MS. WALKER:

2 The next section of this, though, says that "Any  
3 critical ground water areas previously declared by the  
4 commissioner or rules and regulations providing for  
5 determining critical groundwater areas shall remain in  
6 effect until July 1, 2006, or until such time as the  
7 commissioner reviews the declaration or promulgates new  
8 rules pursuant to this Act."

9 That makes it sound like the Sparta designation of  
10 critical could automatically be bumped down by July of  
11 next year.

12 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

13 That was a request the Commissioner made. You know,  
14 maybe he could address the timetable. He was needing  
15 time to promulgate -- you know, to --

16 MS. WALKER:

17 Why was this section even necessary?

18 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

19 Well, it takes time to -- go ahead, Commissioner.

20 MR. WELSH:

21 I was just going to comment, why was it necessary.  
22 I really don't know why it was necessary, but it gives  
23 the Commissioner of Conservation basically one year to do  
24 something, to evaluate the existing order and bring it  
25 into compliance with this new House Bill 388, provided it  
26 becomes law.

27 The discussion a few minutes ago about a critical  
28 area of groundwater concern, that, to me, is very clear  
29 in that if it's necessary to put restrictions on  
30 withdrawal from the aquifer, then you designate it a

1 critical area of groundwater concern. If it's not  
2 necessary to now put restrictions on withdrawal from the  
3 aquifer, then it's an area of groundwater concern. And  
4 addressing that situation would be alternative methods of  
5 dealing with the situation somewhat short of putting  
6 restrictions; for example, public education, encouraging  
7 users to find alternate sources of drinking water, things  
8 like that.

9 MS. WALKER:

10 Well, that raises another question. I'm just  
11 listening and I guess I'm venting here a little bit, but  
12 what I've been hearing in your discussion on education,  
13 the criteria that the Legislature came up with a number  
14 of years ago and in 2003 was quite clear that the way the  
15 water use, prioritization for water use was the highest  
16 need was going to be human consumption, public health and  
17 safety, with other uses to follow, and what I'm hearing  
18 is we're asking the folks in that category to actually --  
19 at the beginning to bear the burden of the conservation,  
20 at least that's the part we're hearing about in the  
21 education efforts, and that seems to me that ought to be  
22 flipped.

23 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

24 Let me just address that a little bit. The areas  
25 that were considered under the request to be critical is  
26 an area in Ouachita Parish, and I serve part of that  
27 area. One of the areas was in the Hodge area, and I also  
28 serve that area. The other one was in Lincoln Parish,  
29 which I do not serve. But let me just share with you  
30 what is going on today, and you heard Tony mention, we

1 did get \$600,000 in capital outlay for the study with the  
2 City of West Monroe to look at cleaning up that water  
3 whereby Graphics Packaging could use that gray water  
4 there. If we get that off, that's one-fourth of the  
5 water usage that it would take in that area. I can  
6 assure you that it's going to move forward. Now, we all  
7 hope it works, we don't know at this point, that's why we  
8 have the study, but we certainly hope it works to be able  
9 to do that. If it does not work, then we take a look at  
10 usage of more river water there in Monroe. But I can  
11 assure you the Legislative delegation is committed to  
12 moving in the direction of helping them. We just wanted  
13 to be able to -- with this study we wanted to be able to  
14 help the City of West Monroe and Graphics Packaging. We  
15 can help two people rather than one, where if we just  
16 went to try to get some money for a clarifier, maybe, for  
17 Graphics Packaging, then that left a lot of water unused.  
18 So now we can -- if this works, that lets us help the  
19 City of West Monroe and also Graphics Packaging.

20 Now, I also filed a legislation creating a reservoir  
21 there in Jackson Parish, which would assist Smurfit-Stone  
22 in their water usage. I also know that Representative  
23 Downs filed the one in Lincoln Parish, but also more  
24 important is the funds that we hope are coming, not only  
25 through the study, but maybe some verbal commitments at  
26 this point for a pipeline from Lake D'Arbonne to the  
27 Farmerville-Ruston area. Now, if we get those three  
28 areas that we're working on, then, you know, we are a  
29 long ways in reducing that usage out of the Sparta. I  
30 think that maybe the new data and the new report that

1 will be coming out later will prove that. But we are  
2 committed. There's more to it than just saying that  
3 we're going to do it. We have made a commitment and  
4 everyone is working in the Legislative delegation to try  
5 to make that happen.

6 MS. WALKER:

7 Thank you.

8 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

9 Any other questions or comments? Mr. Durrett.

10 MR. DURRETT:

11 Yes, I'd like to make a comment or two and then I've  
12 got a question for the Representative. First of all, we  
13 talked about science. All the information that we put in  
14 the application for a critical designation, which was  
15 done in 2002, three years ago, was based on a scientific  
16 study of the Sparta that took some three years and  
17 \$450,000. It was done by a concern of Meyer, Meyer,  
18 LaCroix & Hixson, along with some other, URS, which  
19 you're familiar with here. They did a mod-flow model  
20 study of the effects of the Sparta Aquifer over a period  
21 of time. And that was put into the application, the  
22 results of that in the application for the critical  
23 designation.

24 Now, when the application for critical designation  
25 was made the present law required one of three criteria  
26 in order to declare it critical: either it had to be not  
27 self-sustaining, in other words, dropping more than a  
28 foot a year; be below the top of the aquifer; or have  
29 saltwater intrusion, one of those three. Basically, we  
30 met two of the three; at that time we didn't have the

1 saltwater intrusion information, which we now have from -  
2 - that we're doing with USGS, but that information will  
3 be put in.

4 My question is, under the new legislation, what is  
5 the criteria that moves it from area of concern to  
6 critical area? We had the criteria that was required in  
7 the original legislation that made it critical. Now  
8 what's the criteria that moves from the area of concern  
9 to critical?

10 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

11 Well, I think that's why we asked for the 12 months  
12 so that we can promulgate the rules that needs to be put  
13 forth to make sure that when it is labeled that it's  
14 labeled correctly. I can't tell you that, I'm leaving  
15 that up to the Commission to put those rules in place.

16 MR. DURRETT:

17 So are we going to have to start our application  
18 process all over again once we know what the criteria is?  
19 I mean, we followed everything that the law said we  
20 needed to do in the beginning.

21 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

22 Mr. Durrett, I'm sure you're aware and, Commission,  
23 you may not be, but we went before the Sparta Commission  
24 as a legislative delegation to ask them to withdraw this  
25 request and to work with us whereby we could put these  
26 things in place where we can all work together. Now, I'm  
27 not here to tell you whether they did or whether they  
28 didn't, but -- I'm not sure there was a quorum that night  
29 at that meeting, I'm not totally sure there was a quorum  
30 when the request was made. I didn't want to go into all

1 of that to determine that and I know Mr. Durrett was  
2 asked that question by one of the Sparta members in a  
3 letter requesting him and it was not answered.

4 Now, folks, the legislative delegation is a  
5 delegation that's elected by the people to serve the  
6 people and we take an oath just like the Sparta  
7 Commission, but it's in the best interest -- the Sparta  
8 is at least 16 parishes and maybe more. Now, I have  
9 resolutions from several of the Police Jury supporting  
10 House Bill 388. I have resolutions and the Governor will  
11 have from Chambers supporting House Bill 388. But the  
12 only one that seems to not support it and not be willing  
13 to work is the folks, my neighbors to the north, and  
14 these are friends that I respect. But I think you have  
15 to be inclusive of everyone. It can't be just a few  
16 folks that make these requests.

17 So I would urge you as a commission to make sure  
18 when these requests come in that they do consider  
19 everyone, not just a few folks, and I would hope and I  
20 would ask this recommendation from you, Mr. Durrett, in  
21 front of this commission that maybe you would just, as  
22 chairman, would volunteer to move your commission  
23 meetings and hold them in all the parishes, rather than  
24 only hold them in Lincoln Parish whereby it would be  
25 easier for everyone to participate. I don't think it's  
26 good to get here in a little family squabble, but I think  
27 there are some things that would better the Sparta  
28 Commission in that everyone would feel free to be able to  
29 participate and feel like that they've had a say in all  
30 16 parishes. So I hope you'll work with us, Mr. Durrett,



1 in doing this and make it a commission that we can all be  
2 proud of, but I urge you to be careful in making your  
3 decisions in that make sure that everyone has an input.

4 My concern as a representative of House District 13  
5 and as a member of this legislative body is that everyone  
6 has an opportunity to be heard. Now, when these bills  
7 were passing through the House Committee process, the  
8 Senate hearing, there was no opposition at all to any of  
9 these bills. Now, if folks -- the way the process works  
10 in Louisiana, that's why we have committee hearings, it's  
11 open to the public. You can come and sit, just like I'm  
12 sitting at this table today, and we can debate those  
13 issues and then the full committee decides whether it  
14 moves forward. All of them don't always move forward.  
15 You heard some today that was not moved forward. But  
16 this Bill had no opposition in House committee, it moved  
17 out of the House unanimous, no opposition; on the Senate  
18 side no opposition in Senate committee and had only one  
19 vote against it on the Senate Floor. So it did have a  
20 lot of debate and it had a lot of opportunities for those  
21 that were opposed to this legislation to come to the  
22 table and debate the issues with us. It's a fair system  
23 and I think it was heard properly.

24 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

25 Can I make a -- let me just mention, let's try to  
26 keep any discussion --

27 MR. DURRETT:

28 I understand that. I just want to make -- I'm not  
29 debating 388 and I'm not debating the Sparta Commission.  
30 I just asked a question, I was trying to understand what

1 is the criteria to go from area of concern to the  
2 critical area, that's my only question. Thank you.

3 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

4 Karen, do you have a question?

5 MS. GAUTREAUX:

6 I just wanted to rehash my understanding of why I  
7 wasn't necessarily concerned about during this  
8 legislative process. It was my understanding there was a  
9 desire for another designation that indicated things were  
10 of concern but the Commissioner had not chosen to  
11 implement restrictions of any sort. Now, it was also my  
12 understanding, for example, in the section that Linda  
13 called attention to that the application could be  
14 submitted as an area of groundwater concern, but that did  
15 not preclude the Commissioner from looking at the same  
16 criteria. It's my understanding that's one of the  
17 reasons for the monitoring requirement in the Order. If  
18 the Commissioner sees that conditions have worsened, he  
19 still has the ability to place those restrictions.

20 So the criteria haven't changed, the monitoring  
21 information will show as to whether or not the situation  
22 is worsening or getting better and additional  
23 restrictions need to take place. There's nothing in  
24 there -- and it was also my understanding in terms of the  
25 rulemaking was now you have a different designation, that  
26 needs to be explained how it's going to operate, not to  
27 lessen anything, but to reconcile the new law with -- I  
28 mean, put the new law into the old law and reconcile  
29 where it needs to be tweaked in the rules. But there was  
30 nothing, I was told, that would make a difference in the

1 process. You were just inserting another classification  
2 that indicated the severity of the problem, which was an  
3 issue with the delegation up there. Am I --

4 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

5 You are exactly right.

6 MR. LOEWER:

7 We sit here on this commission as Act 49 being our  
8 Bible, that it causes us to -- it created this commission  
9 and it is the one by which we operate. Now, if Act 49 is  
10 amended, as this will, the way I understand it if the  
11 Governor signs it, then we have to be very clear on what  
12 it means for us. In reading through this it seems to be  
13 the criteria for an area of concern is if the  
14 sustainability of an aquifer is not being maintained,  
15 period; if the criteria for critical groundwater area  
16 would be sustainability cannot be maintained without  
17 withdrawal restrictions. Is that -- I mean, that's  
18 basically the understanding.

19 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

20 That's clear and simple, it is, sir.

21 MS. IRION:

22 The Department of Health and Hospitals also reviewed  
23 this Bill and tracked it and didn't see that it was going  
24 to interfere with the Sparta groundwater designation  
25 either, or any other critical ground water. It just gave  
26 the Commissioner, actually, a little bit more authority,  
27 and we didn't have a problem with it.

28 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

29 Mr. Cefalu?

30 MR. CEFALU:

1           It just broadened his authority. I just wanted to  
2 ask the Commissioner, are you comfortable with the bill,  
3 first of all, in being able to enact your authority on  
4 49?

5 MR. WELSH:

6           Yes, I am comfortable with the bill. Many up here  
7 on the panel and some in the audience deal with  
8 regulation on a day-to-day basis and as I've testified at  
9 several of the committees, hardly anything is black or  
10 white or good or bad or up or down, it's somewhere in the  
11 middle.

12 MR. CEFALU:

13           It's all gray water.

14 MR. WELSH:

15           It's an aquifer, okay, and that helps me as a  
16 regulator to put the proper, if you want to call it,  
17 label on the situation. After analyzing the problem I  
18 feel like it's in the interest, the public interest to  
19 have a term that adequately and accurately describes the  
20 situation, not under talks it or over talks it; it tries  
21 to put the category, the label on the situation that is  
22 as accurate as possible. I think that's a hard thing to  
23 do writing laws, but I think that is a noble thing to  
24 shoot for is to have as easy an understood law as --

25 MR. CEFALU:

26           Well, before you had the choice to either say, no,  
27 it's not critical -- as the Commissioner, you make that  
28 decision -- it's not critical, no matter what scientific  
29 data they send you, and I'll say when it's critical,  
30 y'all just keep giving me data. Now what you're doing is

1 giving them a warning.

2 I represent the Police Jury Association, as you have  
3 representation, of every unincorporated area in this  
4 state, and the state boys up here, which are in the  
5 majority most of the time, know very well that I'm not  
6 going to stand still and see the people be pushed over.  
7 And you evidently got involved with this bill because  
8 some businesses got concerned about having to do  
9 something they wasn't having to do before. My only  
10 concern is that when we fought this thing to try and come  
11 up with the Bible is that we would have a tool to work  
12 with in the state that no matter who is at fault we solve  
13 the problem. I think what we're going to find is there  
14 is going to be a lot of concerns, a lot more concerns,  
15 probably not just this aquifer, in all of the aquifers  
16 before it's all over with, and what we found in the  
17 studies is that 70 percent of the water usage is being  
18 taken by businesses and only 30 percent by the people.  
19 And once -- the businesses can always move somewhere  
20 else, but the people will live there and the drinking  
21 water was critical, it was critical that they had  
22 drinking water.

23 So I think it's great to talk conservation and like  
24 you said, it really does -- the people have to do it, and  
25 the gray water thing with the sewage treatment plant, we  
26 do that in areas in St. Mary Parish where we need  
27 additional waters and there's a plant by, you try to use  
28 those waters. They're actually very clean coming from  
29 sewage treatment plants. But I've always said from the  
30 beginning, get the businesses off the aquifers, if

1 possible, don't charge them nothing, let's pay for it,  
2 but let's get them all off the aquifers and our problems  
3 are done. We have so much surface water around here,  
4 it's not like we need, you know, we have a water problem;  
5 and then we've solved all of our problems.

6 But since what you said about the people that are  
7 above us, and I'm assuming the state above us, if that's  
8 the same aquifer and they're not having the same  
9 restrictions we're having, we may be -- it doesn't matter  
10 what he says because he will not be able to -- he can  
11 restrict the people in Louisiana, but if somebody in  
12 Arkansas is using the same aquifer and they are depleting  
13 it, is that not going to deplete -- I'm not a scientist,  
14 but is that not going to deplete our aquifer? So maybe  
15 we need to do a little bit more work between the states,  
16 too, to try and see if they won't go along with our  
17 restrictions so that we could have something similar. We  
18 don't want to have a problem above us and then it becomes  
19 our problem because, you know, they wasn't doing the same  
20 things that we're doing.

21 But I understand your concern; I don't have a  
22 problem with it as long as he's concerned. The only  
23 problem with anything that you get passed in legislation  
24 that becomes law, I know you have to change things now  
25 and then and you have to adjust things, but the first  
26 thing I thought of when this bill came up is, here we go  
27 again with the politics in Louisiana. We had a great  
28 bill in place to try and do something good for everybody  
29 and now here come the politics, somebody's complaining  
30 that they got to get in line. I don't like to see

1 amendments to anything that's already done. He doesn't  
2 really need this designation, but it doesn't hurt where  
3 we're at, so it does give somebody a warning, but we need  
4 to take care of business in Louisiana, and by pushing or  
5 putting off the inevitable is not taking care of  
6 business. So I would hope that this new designation  
7 would just be the yellow light, I guess, the warning  
8 light to the people in that area that, hey, if y'all  
9 don't do something we're going to have to do something.

10 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

11 I do appreciate those comments, but in reference to  
12 that let me say that prior to 2003 and the groundwater  
13 act that we did have in place had a middle designation to  
14 it. Those of you that were involved know how hectic it  
15 was in dealing with Act 49, with the different authors  
16 and the pieces there. You know, sometimes through the  
17 heat of battle things get left out, you understand that,  
18 where maybe we should have gone and had that one in there  
19 at the time and through the heat of battle it was not put  
20 back in. But prior to 2003 this state did have a middle  
21 designation. So thank you.

22 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

23 Any other?

24 (No response.)

25 REPRESENTATIVE FANNIN:

26 Thank you, members, appreciate the opportunity,  
27 again.

28 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

29 At this time we'll come to the Commission comments.  
30 Are there any general comments? Mr. Cefalu?

1 MR. CEFALU:

2 All what I didn't get to say before I'd like to say  
3 now. You know, we spend a lot of time doing a lot of  
4 things and people that work for the state are here all  
5 the time and they deal with this all the time, and I just  
6 happen to have to travel a little bit, and I don't mind  
7 coming to meetings, but, you know, from the start of what  
8 we went through to get 49 passed and to get something in  
9 place, and, you know, there's problems with ground water  
10 throughout the state of Louisiana. I just wanted to  
11 voice my opinion. I'm ready to see some action on -- if  
12 it's a model that we have to draw up or whatever,  
13 whatever it takes to satisfy the general public.

14 Conservation is great; I've tried every one of those  
15 products except the magnets you put on your icebox, and I  
16 don't think anybody at my house was satisfied with any of  
17 them. I guess if it came down to the fact that you  
18 wasn't gonna have any drinking water you may consider  
19 those strongly. If it were surface water, I just pay the  
20 water bill.

21 But the problems I see is, I don't want to see this  
22 commission get bogged down and not functioning and  
23 getting things done and going forward with the needs of  
24 this state. I am very concerned about an adjacent state  
25 that may have a commission or law similar to us that may  
26 not be as restrictive in which we may lose businesses to  
27 that state because they're not going to restrict them on  
28 the groundwater intake. I'm concerned about that. I'm  
29 also concerned about the fact that there may be an  
30 aquifer problem with the Sparta Aquifer and it's not



1 being addressed quick enough. I don't know if you can --  
2 you know, if it gets to the point to where it crashes or  
3 whatever happens to aquifers and the people don't even  
4 get the drinking water, we really have a problem.

5 So I just want to voice my opinion that I thought we  
6 were going pretty good progressively, we were going very  
7 progressively in trying to address the needs of the  
8 state, and when I saw this bill come up I was really  
9 concerned about someone trying to throw things in the way  
10 of progress. But as you can see it really wasn't that,  
11 maybe it should've been put in originally, but we need to  
12 start throwing up whatever necessary warning lights that  
13 we need to throw up throughout the state. We do need to  
14 probably try and get some dollars, I don't know if DNR  
15 has the money or whatever, for education, but I thought  
16 we had all of those things in place already through all  
17 the different organizations, but maybe that has never  
18 been, quote, been something specific to ground water, and  
19 that needs to be done.

20 The American wetlands thing, I know all of y'all  
21 have seen what we've been doing with American wetlands.  
22 I sit on that PACE Commission, and I mean, some people  
23 just aren't aware of what's going on in the country, and  
24 in Louisiana, and maybe there's people in Louisiana that  
25 are not aware of what's going on with our aquifer and we  
26 need to educate them.

27 But I just want to see a little more action. If it  
28 gets too dull I'm going to resign because I'm an action  
29 guy, I want to see some action, whether it's indifferent  
30 or not, I just -- I think we need to go forward, because

1 this 49 is going to sit there and we got until next  
2 year's legislation or a special session for them to shoot  
3 at us again. Let's try and get something done before  
4 next year so that we can try and make something happen  
5 and make a difference for ground water in the state.

6 Now, the last time we were here we discussed, and,  
7 Mr. Chairman, if you can maybe refresh my memory, I think  
8 we discussed that we were only going to deal with ground  
9 water with these regulations, that we were not going to  
10 look at surface waters at this time?

11 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

12 I don't remember a specific conversation, but  
13 obviously, ground water is what we're --

14 MR. CEFALU:

15 Our main interest was surface waters when I first  
16 got appointed to this commission.

17 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

18 And everybody appreciates that the two -- it's  
19 difficult to separate the two, so we --

20 MR. CEFALU:

21 I've since found out that the need for surface water  
22 concerns were really nothing to do with drinking water  
23 because there's so much surface waters, wherever there is  
24 any, but it was something else, so -- but let's try and  
25 have some action items on the next agenda, as of that we  
26 can do to try and solve the problems and if it's changing  
27 some of the regulations, I don't have a problem with that  
28 either. Let's do something to get something in place  
29 that's going to substantiate what we're trying to do with  
30 ground water and saving the ground water for drinking for

1 the people that need the ground water.

2 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

3 Mr. Cefalu, just to follow up on that, the  
4 Commission is in an interesting position because in large  
5 part our activities are to review the decisions of the  
6 Office of Conservation, so we almost react to things they  
7 do rather than promote things that we can do.

8 The one issue that we are allowed to move forward on  
9 in particular, though, is developing a statewide  
10 groundwater management plan, and so I think, as we talked  
11 about last time, that is, I think, the place where most  
12 of our efforts need to be placed. And hopefully -- we  
13 weren't able to get our task force together in a  
14 meaningful way between this meeting and last, but I think  
15 that's the first step to putting that groundwater  
16 management plan together and developing certain  
17 conservation education tools. So certainly if you are  
18 ready for some action I think that would be the place to  
19 find it. So hopefully we can make some progress between  
20 now and the next meeting on that and develop some ideas.

21 Commissioner Welsh, do you have any thoughts on  
22 those?

23 MR. WELSH:

24 No.

25 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

26 Anybody else have general comments?

27 MS. IRION:

28 I was just going to say that EPA has really put a  
29 lot of effort recently behind conservation efforts in the  
30 conservation education efforts and they've put out a lot

1 of materials and education packages and things like that.  
2 So I know where those are and if the Commissioner wants I  
3 can get him -- we can get certain amounts free and some  
4 we may have to pay for, but I'm just saying that we can  
5 take advantage of these existing free items when we need  
6 to, and certainly I can help with that.

7 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

8 I think that's great because the ground water office  
9 will soon be developing the conservation education plan  
10 for the areas of groundwater concern.

11 MS. IRION:

12 As you know, other states haven't got any water, so  
13 they've run out, they basically don't have any, and they  
14 are in critical need of conservation and so a lot of  
15 these packages have been developed because of that. We  
16 can certainly take advantage of the free opportunities  
17 that EPA's been developing.

18 MS. GAUTREAUX:

19 I was just going to mention that we have a fairly  
20 active outreach group and I think a lot of the things  
21 that -- Linda may want to comment on that. It seemed  
22 like there were a lot of good ideas that have been  
23 developed that all need to be implemented.

24 MS. WALKER:

25 I don't really have a comment on that. I think all  
26 of that has been recorded somewhere in minutes that we  
27 have outlines of everything that we did under that  
28 committee, but it needs to probably be -- it's gonna have  
29 to be under the task force and rejuvenated. But I do  
30 have a request that we plan a commission meeting next

1 time during the legislative session during the session,  
2 because this was really a welcome discussion and I felt  
3 like we needed to have at least a commission meeting that  
4 we can look at legislation during the session. I think  
5 that would be very fruitful in the future.

6 MS. GAUTREAUX:

7 I was just going to suggest maybe to the staff,  
8 because I do know the challenges of herding cats during  
9 sessions sometimes, but maybe just as you are checking  
10 out legislation that impacts water resources perhaps you  
11 could distribute bulletins, and then there can be maybe  
12 some follow-up discussions if necessary, if we can't  
13 convene -- I mean, it would be nice if we could, but I  
14 know the realities of that challenge sometimes.

15 MS. IRION:

16 Yeah, I know we monitor the legislature very closely  
17 at my office and I had called to ask about this bill  
18 early on and had requested that they send out, like, a  
19 note out, but I don't think that ever got out.

20 MR. DUPLECHIN:

21 I'm not sure.

22 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

23 Any other comments?

24 (No response.)

25 We'll move to Task Force comments. Anybody here  
26 from the Task Force have any comments, if you'd like to  
27 come up, identify yourself.

28 MR. DUEX:

29 Good afternoon. My name is Tim Duex representing  
30 the University of Louisiana, and I'd like to request an

1 update or clarification on the rules for establishing  
2 regional aquifer stakeholders groups.

3 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

4 Tony, can you provide an update?

5 MR. DUPLÉCHIN:

6 No further action has been taken on developing those  
7 rules since we had a discussion two meetings ago on  
8 putting off development of those rules.

9 MR. DUEX:

10 Do we have a timetable, some goal that we can set in  
11 some way? It was a little over a year ago that Don  
12 Broussard and I requested the establishment of a Chicot  
13 Aquifer Stakeholders Group and that's still kind of on  
14 hold right now.

15 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

16 Tony, can you provide any -- I've forgotten why  
17 maybe those were put on hold. Could you refresh my  
18 memory?

19 MR. DUPLÉCHIN:

20 It kind of got to be we didn't want to put the cart  
21 before the horse. The way that the statute reads, a  
22 group can't come forward and ask to be identified as a  
23 regional stakeholder group. The Commissioner had to  
24 draft rules and regulations identifying what made up each  
25 group, and we had drafted rules and passed them out and  
26 the Commission reviewed them, and I'd have to look back  
27 through the transcripts to see exactly why it was decided  
28 to forgo those efforts at the time.

29 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

30 Does anybody else remember?

1 (No response.)

2 Okay, maybe we'll look into that and give an update  
3 to Mr. Duex and maybe we can discuss that at the next  
4 meeting if no action has been taken before then.

5 MR. DUEX:

6 I don't know what the rules are, but can I make a  
7 formal request to have some type of summary by the next  
8 meeting? Is that a possible --

9 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

10 Tony can certainly -- we'll make that an agenda item  
11 for the next meeting, to discuss that, if possible.

12 MR. DUEX:

13 Thank you.

14 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

15 Any other Task Force members? I do know we've got  
16 some public comments, so y'all come on up.

17 MR. COLEMAN:

18 Mr. Commissioner, I'm Gene Coleman, I'm on the  
19 Advisory Task Force for the Sparta Commission, and also a  
20 Sparta Commission member. One of the things I do hope is  
21 that there's been a lot of time and effort by commission  
22 members on a volunteer basis put into studying the issues  
23 that relate to the Sparta Aquifer.

24 We made a recommendation to this Board and the  
25 Commissioner, you know, that certain actions be taken  
26 based on good scientific -- the best scientific  
27 information that was available at the time. I certainly  
28 want to commend any and everybody that can be a part of  
29 any of the solutions that we have and the challenges we  
30 face with the Sparta, but I think time is of the essence

1 and I think we need as much direction as possible and as  
2 much leadership, perhaps, as possible from this  
3 Commission and the Commissioner himself for people who  
4 are interested in trying to arrive at good, adequate  
5 solutions to problems.

6 We don't think -- I do believe that the Commission,  
7 Sparta Commission feels like it has all the answers, but  
8 we feel like we have some of the answers type of thing,  
9 and we will respect whatever ruling that the Commissioner  
10 makes about the thing. I would like to encourage as much  
11 as possible -- the Claiborne Parish Watershed District  
12 and Dr. Stuart here is available for comment -- we've had  
13 some more water fairs that had to do with wetland issues  
14 that you referred to, emphasizing the things that we talk  
15 about in the parish throughout the school system, and  
16 we've been doing that about four or five years. I think  
17 if each parish had an active, involved watershed district  
18 that is appointed by the Police Jury Association to  
19 inform the public to try to do research and do leg work  
20 and work and coordinate with y'all, that we would be much  
21 better off than we are today with, in some cases, a lot  
22 of different bills that, while well intended, some may  
23 bring about results that would be different from what is  
24 anticipated.

25 And so I just wish that every parish, including  
26 Lincoln and our other parishes around us, had a watershed  
27 commission and that they would work and try to inform  
28 themselves and work with other parish commissioners.  
29 We've been working quite well, I think, with the Webster  
30 Parish District, and we had these kits that Tony's



1 talking about. We started passing those out about three  
2 years ago in Claiborne Parish. We need to all try to  
3 get, as best we can, on the same page, so to speak, and  
4 learn from each other. And certainly we feel like we  
5 have a lot to learn.

6 But that Sparta Aquifer don't know where that  
7 Arkansas or Louisiana parish/state line is and the  
8 issues, some of the actions that they're taking in  
9 Arkansas that I've been privy to are quite aggressive and  
10 much more restrictive than even some of the laws that we  
11 have in Louisiana. I believe at the present time they  
12 charge about \$.36 per thousand gallons, which is a pretty  
13 good deterrent for wasting water, you know, if you pump  
14 it out of the Sparta and, of course, they're utilizing  
15 those funds for educational purposes, they're utilizing  
16 it for incentives for industry, you know, type of thing.  
17 And so some of the things that we need to know we can  
18 learn from other people who have faced a more severe  
19 problem, such as California and Arkansas.

20 I just hope that we would start to move more  
21 expeditiously and continue to do what we are doing and  
22 just do it better and faster. It kind of gets back to  
23 the old thing of, what is our plan, the overall plan.  
24 And, you know, if we don't have a plan, then we have a  
25 plan and it's a plan to fail to achieve what we should  
26 and could achieve. So I just say let's try to get a  
27 plan, and let's all try to be a part of the solution  
28 rather than a part of the problem. Thank you.

29 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

30 Any other Task Force comments?

1 (No response.)

2 Anybody from the public like to speak? I know we  
3 have one. Yes, sir, come on up, identify yourself.

4 MR. MAYS:

5 Members of the Commission, I appreciate you allowing  
6 me, Mickey Mays, President of the Lincoln Parish Police  
7 Jury, to make this presentation. Some of you in this  
8 room are very aware of everything that I'm going to  
9 present. There will be some things that will be referred  
10 to from studies, and those studies are the Sparta  
11 groundwater study that was done in 2004. So I would like  
12 to say that this information, some of it is now four  
13 years old. If you would allow me.

14 This first map is a map of the Sparta in Louisiana,  
15 and this area (indicating,) that area right there, the  
16 green is the aquifer area and the blue is the recharge  
17 area.

18 The history, the first meeting to discuss the  
19 declining levels of the region's primary source of  
20 drinking water was held in Ruston in February of '97. I  
21 would like to add that when I was on the Police Jury in  
22 1980 we did a study, it was an update of a study in '60  
23 and we realized that there was a problem in about '82.  
24 So the awareness of this has been going on for some time.  
25 The Sparta Commission has worked closely with Southern  
26 Arkansas, the USGS, LSU Ag. Center Extension Service.  
27 The Louisiana Legislature created the Sparta Groundwater  
28 Conservation District in 1999 and the commission was made  
29 up of 10 members appointed by Police Juries, six members  
30 appointed by cities that use 500,000 gallons per day or

1 more, and three members appointed by industry, wood  
2 products, agriculture product interest and other  
3 industry, but basically poultry.

4 The funding received from the Legislature in '99 to  
5 2000 was to do a detailed engineering study of the Sparta  
6 and here it is. I would like to say that this is going  
7 to be further on, but this study and a lot of other  
8 information is on our Web site and I'll give you that  
9 address for any of you that would like to access that  
10 later on. The study was done Meyer, Meyer, LaCroix &  
11 Hixson, and this area right here shows you the map of  
12 where the water level is dropping more than one foot per  
13 year, and the left side still -- the darker area, is the  
14 recharge area. So you can see where the areas that are  
15 dropping more than one foot per year.

16 This is the level that is below the top of the  
17 aquifer with the recharge area still there. Right here  
18 is an overlay of both of those, and as you can see  
19 Lincoln Parish is the bull's eye there. So this is where  
20 we're coming from. These are the major users of the  
21 Sparta Aquifer for 2000. If you'll notice there the  
22 major users and the percent, they don't total up to 100,  
23 so the major users only total up to 87.1 percent:  
24 Ouachita Parish with 33.9; Bienville Parish with 17.7;  
25 Lincoln with 13.1; Webster with 9.3; Union with 8.7;  
26 Claiborne, 4.4. That's 60 of approximately 70 something  
27 million gallons a day.

28 This is a hydrograph here of a well in Jackson,  
29 that's JA-147. This is USGS data, dropping more than 1.5  
30 feet per year. You can see the data goes back to 1976,

1 and you can see what that decline is.

2 This is a Lincoln well, L-26, dropping more than two  
3 feet per year, starting about in '65 or somewhere around  
4 there, and that's going down to the present, that's over  
5 two feet per year as it shows.

6 MR. CEFALU:

7 That well is 20' above sea level. Is water just  
8 coming out of the ground?

9 MR. MAYS:

10 Any questions, technically, you have to ask Ben,  
11 because he compiled this. I only happen to be -- OU-402,  
12 at 3/4 of a foot per year, data since -- I think that's  
13 in '68 or so, '67. UN-134 starting in '79 there at two  
14 feet per year.

15 The Sparta study that we referenced, the current  
16 Sparta pumpage is 70 million gallons per day. I would  
17 like to reemphasize that that's a 2000 number. The  
18 sustainable that you talked about earlier, Commissioner,  
19 by the study was 52 million gallons per day, and that was  
20 as of 2000, these numbers.

21 The prioritized recommendations were treatment and  
22 pipelines needed. Ouachita River at West Monroe, 10  
23 million gallons per day; Bayou D'Arbonne, 6.5 million  
24 that y'all referenced that Senator Vitter said there was  
25 about \$250,000. It's going to take about \$750,000 for  
26 the study to determine if it's feasible to run a pipeline  
27 from D'Arbonne Lake to be utilized in Union and Lincoln  
28 Parish. Today's dollars that's 60 million, estimated.  
29 Ouachita River at Bastrop, 4 million gallons; Caney  
30 Creek, 6 million gallons; Lake Bistineau, Claiborne, 3.5

1 for a total of 30.

2 As y'all well know the application for portions of  
3 the Sparta groundwater aquifer to be declared a critical  
4 groundwater area was submitted in August of '02 to the  
5 Louisiana Ground Water Management Commission. The goal  
6 of the Sparta Groundwater Conservation District  
7 Commission: to save and restore the Sparta Aquifer for  
8 long-term future use and a major water supply source for  
9 domestic, industrial, and agricultural use.

10 Criteria for a critical groundwater area  
11 designation. The project committee considered three  
12 alternatives for designation: those areas where the water  
13 level is dropping more than one foot per year, those  
14 areas where the water surface has dropped below the top  
15 of the Sparta Aquifer, and those areas where saltwater  
16 intrusion is becoming a problem. Those are the same  
17 areas that Arkansas -- I mean, the same criteria that  
18 Arkansas used except Arkansas had a five-year average on  
19 the one foot.

20 This right here shows the saltwater of OU-78. If  
21 you'll notice on this graph at 250 milligrams per liter  
22 that's considered saltwater, and as of this date here you  
23 look at the increase, it's about 36 per year and we're up  
24 there at almost well over two times the designated  
25 saltwater levels. This is another well in Spearsville,  
26 had an increase of four milligrams per liter per year.  
27 As you can see it starts off above the saltwater  
28 designation, that's not even on this graph in 1999, right  
29 at it.

30 UN-206, you can see that this one right here is

1 increasing at 4.6 milligrams per year, but it has not  
2 reached the saltwater level. This is Winnfield. This  
3 right here shows the Sparta Aquifer as approximately half  
4 of it is in Arkansas, half of it is in Louisiana, two  
5 designations that Arkansas used for their critical  
6 designation to get their bill, and I think in your packet  
7 today that bill was there for a reference on how they  
8 handled their problem.

9 Recommended solutions: develop incentives for the  
10 major users to reduce their usage of the Sparta Aquifer.  
11 I think everybody here today has mentioned that as a  
12 solution.

13 Develop a funding mechanism for the purpose of a  
14 public conservation education program. I've heard that  
15 from everyone here today also.

16 Require metering of wells 50,000 gallons per day and  
17 larger to measure the actual usage. I think y'all heard  
18 the data that says that maybe 10 percent of them have  
19 meters on these wells now.

20 And these are some quotes from our area up there:  
21 "The situation is simply not critical," from Senator  
22 Kostelka, and Senator Downs quoted Commissioner Welsh to  
23 say that there was a problem with the Sparta but he  
24 didn't necessarily think it was a critical problem.

25 "The groundwater supply in both the Alluvial and  
26 Sparta Aquifers is reaching a critical state," the  
27 Mississippi River Commission.

28 Governor Huckabee of Arkansas, "The depletion of the  
29 Sparta Aquifer is one of the most critical problems  
30 currently facing the State of Arkansas.

1           "There's absolutely no question what north Louisiana  
2           is facing is a major threat from aquifer depletion.  
3           Keeping the 'critical' terminology should help Louisiana  
4           get help for the Sparta." That's Sherrel Johnson of  
5           Union County Water Conservation Board. And they have  
6           made a lot of changes up there and are getting their  
7           problem resolved. We've heard a lot of people say it's  
8           got to be an effort from all of us to get this problem  
9           resolved; the states, the feds, people, conservation,  
10          industry, we're all going to have to work together to get  
11          it resolved.

12          "The areas of significant groundwater depletion in  
13          the United States include the Sparta Aquifer in the  
14          southeastern United States," USGS Service in a report to  
15          Congress.

16          I want to thank y'all for the opportunity to make  
17          this presentation. I hope that it was informative and I  
18          hope that it did not just use up any of your time. I  
19          would like the Commissioner to take this into  
20          consideration and at a minimum keep the critical  
21          designations as they're proposed now, but really would  
22          like to have the entire Sparta deemed critical. Thank  
23          you.

24          MR. KIRKPATRICK:

25                 Thank you, Mr. Mays. Are there any questions?

26          MR. MAYS:

27                 There's our Web site there.

28          MR. KIRKPATRICK:

29                 Any questions? Mr. Knochenmus?

30          MR. KNOCHENMUS:

1           In the presentation on sustainability, the result of  
2   52 million gallons, does that use the same well  
3   distribution, same well field distribution as the 70  
4   million gallons? In other words, you're saying it's  
5   sustainable at 52, I believe it was.

6   MR. MAYS:

7           Well --

8   MR. KNOCHENMUS:

9           Did you use the same well field distribution?

10   MR. MAYS:

11           Those numbers came out of the study and that's the  
12   assumption that I have that it's the same, it's the  
13   entire aquifer in Louisiana. Does that answer your  
14   question?

15   MR. KNOCHENMUS:

16           Well, not really. I was really asking when you get  
17   to 70, the use of 70 million gallons, which allows the  
18   drawdown, and then you found out or they found out that  
19   it's sustainable at 52 million gallons, but I just  
20   wondered what they used as the well field distribution,  
21   if it was the same as currently being used or whether  
22   this was some other design.

23   MR. MAYS:

24           I'm sorry, sir, I can't answer that question.

25   MR. KNOCHENMUS:

26           Thank you.

27   MS. IRION:

28           I think they're just looking at general withdrawal  
29   rates versus recharge rates and that's how they're  
30   getting their number.



1 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

2 Yes, but you can't do that unless you know -- unless  
3 you distribute your withdrawals throughout the system or  
4 the well field.

5 MS. IRION:

6 That's probably what they did.

7 MR. KNOCHENMUS:

8 So you've got to have an input of a model, you've  
9 got to put it somewhere.

10 MR. DURRETT:

11 You want to comment on that, Ben?

12 MR. MCGEE:

13 The study that was conducted was conducted by Meyer,  
14 Meyer, LaCroix & Hixson, and I don't really feel  
15 comfortable commenting on their study, however, I will  
16 say a similar study to this, as you know, Darwin, was  
17 conducted back in 1985 by the USGS in cooperation with  
18 the Louisiana Tech University and the State. And so I do  
19 know about that study, and the number of 52 million  
20 gallons per day was approximately what that study  
21 determined would be the sustainable yield for the Sparta  
22 Aquifer, and in that particular study the pumping centers  
23 were -- they stayed the same throughout the model period.

24 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

25 Any other questions? I just had one comment like we  
26 had mentioned earlier, the education and conservation  
27 plan will be developed here shortly, so I appreciate  
28 y'all's interest in this and hope that y'all can work  
29 with the Commissioner to kind of offer whatever resources  
30 and knowledge y'all have to try to develop an effective

1 conservation education campaign for up in your area.

2 MR. MAYS:

3 We look forward to working with the Commissioner on  
4 that.

5 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

6 Any other public comments? Thank you very much.

7 (No response.)

8 No other public comments. Tony, do you want to  
9 comment on the next meeting, any thoughts?

10 MR. DUPLECHIN:

11 As all of you know, the statute requires the  
12 Commission to meet once a quarter, or more often if  
13 necessary. If you'll remember back the last time we met,  
14 we had planned on meeting during the Session, but  
15 decision was made as time came around for that meeting  
16 that it might be better to wait until the Session was  
17 over to have this meeting today. Dates for the next  
18 meeting, sometime July, August, September, I would  
19 suggest possibly the beginning of September. That would  
20 allow us to get some of the things done that we need to  
21 get done as a result of pending legislation going.

22 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

23 Any thoughts on that? We'll look forward -- John?

24 MR. ROUSSEL:

25 Is there a set date for the Task Force to meet?  
26 Because, you know, we were expecting some input from the  
27 Task Force for this meeting but, obviously, that didn't  
28 take place.

29 MR. DUPLECHIN:

30 As soon as the meeting was over last time I sent e-

1 mails out to members of the Task Force soliciting  
2 comments on what parts of the CH Fenstermaker report that  
3 we had done needed to be further addressed.

4 Unfortunately, I only got one response back from the 49  
5 members of the Task Force. I am going to renew those  
6 efforts starting tomorrow and set up definite times for  
7 the Task Force to meet and discuss it that way, if  
8 they're not going to respond to me by e-mail. But we  
9 will be getting a Task Force meeting up within the next  
10 few weeks, including the Outreach Committee.

11 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

12 Tony, you'll be back in touch with everybody about a  
13 meeting time and date?

14 MR. DUPLICHIN:

15 Right, I'll send out some possible dates for a  
16 Commission meeting in early September.

17 MS. IRION:

18 If we stick to Mondays, the first available Monday  
19 in September is the 12th because the Monday before that  
20 is Labor Day.

21 MR. KIRKPATRICK:

22 Thank you. With that is there a motion to adjourn.  
23 (Motion.) So moved. Second? (Second.) Hearing no  
24 objection, the meeting is adjourned.

25

26

27

28

29

30

## CERTIFICATE

I, SUZETTE M. MAGEE, Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was held on June 27, 2005, in the Conservation Hearing Room, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; that I did report the proceedings thereof; that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 60, inclusive, constitute a true and correct transcript of the proceedings thereof.

---

SUZETTE M. MAGEE, CCR #93079

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER